

MULTIPLICITY IN DIFFERENCE GEOMETRY

IVAN TOMAŠIĆ

ABSTRACT. We prove a first principle of preservation of multiplicity in difference geometry, paving the way for the development of a more general intersection theory. In particular, the fibres of a σ -finite morphism between difference curves are all of the same size, when counted with correct multiplicities.

1. INTRODUCTION

Unlike in algebraic geometry, where the goal of intersection theory is quite well-defined and understood, in difference geometry, due to a much richer class of varieties, and a wider range of possible dimensions, there are several levels at which we can pose the question of the existence of an appropriate theory of multiplicity or intersection theory.

In difference geometry, we have two notions of dimension, the *transformational dimension* and the *total dimension*. Total dimension only makes sense (is finite) when transformational dimension is 0, and is more closely related to the usual notions of dimension such as Krull dimension or transcendence degree.

The first possibility for the intersection theory is the following problem. If we have two difference subschemes of complementary transformational dimensions in a given ambient space, their intersection will be of finite total dimension, and, as [9] shows, it makes sense to ask about its *size*. The first hint that a systematic study of this kind of intersection theory may be possible was given in [11], and the author is informed that a substantial piece of work in this direction is Gabriel Giabicani's thesis.

Another possibility, dealing with object closer in size (and nature) to algebraic varieties, but much more mysterious, is to try and intersect difference schemes of complementary total dimension. Unfortunately, in the naïve setting of difference schemes in a strict sense, the points of intersection are blatantly missing, and there is no hope of a smooth theory. The new idea of this paper is that in the context of *generalised difference schemes* the multiplicity principles actually work.

The author hopes that these results will serve as a foundation for a whole new Intersection Theory in Difference Algebraic Geometry.

One of the most remarkable revelations for the author was that the theory of divisors on non-singular difference curves ties in neatly with the existing theory of the divisor class groups of Krull (and Prüfer) domains, the non-noetherian analogues of Dedekind domains.

Date: December 6, 2011.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 03C60, 11G25. Secondary 14G10, 14G15.

Key words and phrases. difference scheme, multiplicity, local difference algebra, Frobenius automorphism, ACFA.

2. GENERALISED DIFFERENCE SCHEMES

For a more detailed account of the material of the present section, including proofs, we refer the reader to [10].

Definition 2.1. A *generalised difference ring* is a pair (A, Σ) , where A is a commutative ring with identity, and Σ is a set of monomorphisms $A \rightarrow A$ such that

- (1) For every $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma$, there exists a (necessarily unique) $\sigma^\tau \in \Sigma$ such that

$$\tau \circ \sigma^\tau = \sigma \circ \tau.$$

- (2) It follows that $\sigma^\sigma = \sigma$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$.

- (3) We also require that for all $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma$,

$$(\sigma^\tau)^\varphi = (\sigma^\varphi)^{(\tau^\varphi)}.$$

A morphism $\varphi : (B, T) \rightarrow (A, \Sigma)$ consists of a ring morphism $\varphi : B \rightarrow A$ and a map $()^\varphi : \Sigma \rightarrow T$ such that

- (1)

$$\varphi \circ \sigma^\varphi = \sigma \circ \varphi.$$

- (2) Moreover, we require that

$$(\tau^\sigma)^\varphi = (\tau^\varphi)^{(\sigma^\varphi)}.$$

Definition 2.2. Let (R, Σ) be an object of a difference category over the category of commutative rings with identity. We shall consider each of the following subsets of $\text{Spec}(R)$ as locally ringed spaces with the Zariski topology and the structure sheaves induced from $\text{Spec}(R)$:

- (1) $\text{Spec}^\sigma(R) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R) : \sigma^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{p}\}$, for any $\sigma \in \Sigma$;
- (2) $\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R) = \cup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$;
- (3) $\text{Spec}^{(\Sigma)}(R) = \cap_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$.

In discussions of induced topology, we shall use the notation $V^\sigma(I)$, $D^\sigma(I)$, $V^\Sigma(I)$, $D^\Sigma(I)$, $V^{(\Sigma)}(I)$, $D^{(\Sigma)}(I)$ for the traces of $V(I)$ and $D(I)$ on $\text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$, $\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)$, $\text{Spec}^{(\Sigma)}(R)$, respectively.

Remark 2.3. Let (R, Σ) be a difference ring. Each $\sigma \in \Sigma$ induces an endomorphism ${}^a\sigma$ of the locally ringed space $(\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R), \mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)})$. Thus we obtain a (generalised) difference object in the category of locally ringed spaces $(\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R), \mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)}, {}^a\Sigma)$, where ${}^a\Sigma = \{{}^a\sigma : \sigma \in \Sigma\}$.

Thus we have a ‘contravariant’ functor Spec mapping an object (R, Σ) to the object $(\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R), \mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)}, {}^a\Sigma)$, and a morphism $(\varphi, ()^\varphi) : (S, T) \rightarrow (R, \Sigma)$ to the morphism

$$({}^a\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}, ()^\varphi) : (\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R), \mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)}, {}^a\Sigma) \rightarrow (\text{Spec}^T(S), \mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec}^T(S)}, {}^aT).$$

Definition 2.4. Let I be an ideal in a difference ring (R, Σ) . We say that:

- (1) I is a Σ -ideal if $\sigma(I) \subseteq I$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$;
- (2) I is Σ -well-mixed if $ab \in I$ implies $ab^\sigma \in I$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma$;
- (3) R itself is well-mixed if the zero ideal is;
- (4) I is Σ -perfect if for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $aa^\sigma \in I$ implies a and a^σ are both in I .

For a set T , we denote by $\{T\}_\Sigma$ the least Σ -perfect ideal containing T .

Proposition 2.5. Let (R, Σ) be a difference ring.

- (1) $V^{(\Sigma)}(I) \subseteq V^{(\Sigma)}(J)$ if and only if $\{I\}_\Sigma \supseteq \{J\}_\Sigma$.
- (2) Let $f \in R$. Then $D^{(\Sigma)}(f)$ is quasi-compact. If Σ is finite, then $D^{(\Sigma)}(f)$ is quasi-compact.

Proposition 2.6. Let (A, Σ) be a well-mixed difference ring (or even ring with a set of monomorphisms), $f \in A$.

- (1) Both canonical morphisms

$$A_{f\Sigma} \rightarrow A_{\{f\}\Sigma} \xrightarrow{\theta} \mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec}^{(\Sigma)} A}(D^{(\Sigma)}(f)),$$

are injective.

If moreover $D^{(\Sigma)}(f)$ is quasi-compact, we have the following.

- (2) For each $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{O}_{X^\Sigma}(D^{(\Sigma)}(f))$, there exist $g_1, \dots, g_r \in A$ such that $D^{(\Sigma)}(f) = \cup_i D^{(\Sigma)}(g_i)$ and there is a section $s \in \mathcal{O}_X(\cup_i D(g_i))$ such that $\bar{s}(x) = s(x)$ for $x \in D^{(\Sigma)}(f)$.
- (3) Let $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{O}_{X^\Sigma}(D^{(\Sigma)}(f))$. The ideal $\text{Ann}(\bar{s}) = \{g \in A : g\bar{s} = 0\}$ is well-mixed.
- (4) Suppose $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{O}_{X^\Sigma}(D^{(\Sigma)}(f))$ and $\mathfrak{p} \in D^{(\Sigma)}(f)$ such that $\bar{s}(\mathfrak{p}) = 0$. Then there is a $g \notin \mathfrak{p}$ such that $g\bar{s} = 0$ (on $D^{(\Sigma)}(f)$).
- (5) Let $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{O}_{X^\Sigma}(D^{(\Sigma)}(f))$ and $\mathfrak{p} \in D^{(\Sigma)}(f)$. There exist $g \notin \mathfrak{p}$ and $a \in A$ such that $g\bar{s} - a = 0$.
- (6) Let $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{O}_{X^\Sigma}(X^\Sigma)$ such that $\bar{s} \upharpoonright D^{(\Sigma)}(f) = 0$. Then there exists a $\nu \in \mathbb{N}[\sigma]$ such that $f^\nu \bar{s} = 0$ (on X^Σ).
- (7) There exist canonical injections $A \xrightarrow{i} \bar{A} = \mathcal{O}_{X^\Sigma}(X^\Sigma) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{X^{(\Sigma)}}(X^{(\Sigma)})$ inducing an isomorphism of difference schemes $(^a i, \tilde{i}) : \text{Spec}^\Sigma(\bar{A}) \rightarrow \text{Spec}^\Sigma(A)$.

Definition 2.7. (1) An *affine difference scheme* is an object $(X, \mathcal{O}_X, \Sigma)$ of the difference category over the category of locally ringed spaces, which is isomorphic to some $\text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)$ for some well-mixed (R, Σ) .

(2) A *difference scheme* is an object $(X, \mathcal{O}_X, \Sigma)$ of the difference category over the category of locally ringed spaces, which is locally an affine difference scheme.

(3) A *morphism of difference schemes* $(X, \mathcal{O}_X, \Sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y, T)$ is just a morphism in the difference category over the category of locally ringed spaces.

Remark 2.8. Given a difference scheme $(X, \mathcal{O}_X, \Sigma)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we define a locally ringed space $X^\sigma = \{x \in X : \sigma(x) = x\}$, together with the topology and structure sheaf induced from $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$. Since $\mathcal{O}_{X^\sigma} := \mathcal{O}_X \upharpoonright X^\sigma$, clearly $\sigma^\sharp \mathcal{O}_{X^\sigma} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{X^\sigma}$ and $(X^\sigma, \mathcal{O}_{X^\sigma}, \sigma)$ is a strict difference scheme. We have the following properties:

- (1) $X = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} X^\sigma$.
- (2) For every $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma$, there is a unique element $\sigma^\tau \in \Sigma$ such that

$$\tau : (X^\sigma, \mathcal{O}_{X^\sigma}, \sigma) \rightarrow (X^{\sigma^\tau}, \mathcal{O}_{X^{\sigma^\tau}}, \sigma^\tau)$$

is a morphism of difference schemes in the strict sense.

- (3) If $\varphi : (X, \mathcal{O}_X, \Sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y, T)$ is a morphism, then for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$ there exists a $\tau := \sigma^\varphi \in T$ such that

$$\varphi \upharpoonright X^\sigma : (X^\sigma, \mathcal{O}_{X^\sigma}, \sigma) \rightarrow (Y^\tau, \mathcal{O}_{Y^\tau}, \tau)$$

is a morphism of difference schemes in the strict sense.

Proposition 2.9. *The ‘global sections’ functor H^0 is left adjoint to the contravariant functor Spec from the category of well-mixed difference rings to the category of difference schemes. For any difference scheme (X, Σ) and any well-mixed difference ring (S, T) (with T finite),*

$$\text{Hom}((X, \Sigma), (\text{Spec}^T(S), T)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}((S, T), (H^0(X), \Sigma)).$$

Remark 2.10. It is worth remarking that, unlike in the algebraic case, Spec^σ and H^0 do not determine an equivalence of categories between the category of well-mixed difference rings and the category of well-mixed affine difference schemes, but only a weaker notion which we might dub temporarily ‘an embedding of categories’ for the lack of a reference: the unit of the adjunction $1 \rightarrow \text{Spec} \circ H^0$ is a natural isomorphism, while the counit $1 \rightarrow H^0 \circ \text{Spec}$ is only a natural injection by 2.6(7). Also, H^0 is not necessarily exact.

Definition 2.11. (1) Let (X, Σ) be a difference scheme and (K, φ) a difference field. A (K, φ) -rational point of (X, Σ) is a morphism $x : \text{Spec}^\varphi(K) \rightarrow (X, \Sigma)$. When $(X, \Sigma) = \text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)$, this means we have a point $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)$ and a local map $(R_{\mathfrak{p}}, \varphi^x) \rightarrow (K, \varphi)$, where φ^x is the image of φ in Σ by the difference structure map $()^x : \{\varphi\} \rightarrow \Sigma$. Alternatively, we have an inclusion $(\mathbf{k}(\mathfrak{p}), \varphi^x) \hookrightarrow (K, \varphi)$.

(2) Let (X, Σ) be a difference scheme over a difference field (k, σ) and let $(k, \sigma) \subseteq (K, \varphi)$. The set of (K, φ) -rational points of (X, Σ) , henceforth denoted by $(X, \Sigma)(K, \varphi)$, is the set of all (k, σ) -morphisms $\text{Spec}^\varphi(K) \rightarrow (X, \Sigma)$.

If (R, σ_0) is a difference ring, the *difference polynomial ring* $R\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} = R[x_1, \dots, x_n]_\sigma$ in n variables over (R, σ_0) is defined as the polynomial ring

$$R[x_{1,i}, \dots, x_{n,i} : i \geq 0],$$

together with the unique endomorphism σ which acts as σ_0 on R and maps $x_{j,i}$ to $x_{j,i+1}$.

Definition 2.12. Let (R, σ) be a difference ring.

- (1) An (R, σ) -algebra (S, σ) is of *finite σ -type* if it is an equivariant quotient of some difference polynomial ring $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]_\sigma$. Equivalently, there exist $a_1, \dots, a_n \in S$ such that $S = R[a_1, \dots, a_n]_\sigma$.
- (2) An (R, σ) -difference scheme (X, σ) is of *finite σ -type* if it is a finite union of affine difference schemes of the form $\text{Spec}^\sigma(S)$, where (S, σ) is of finite σ -type over (R, σ) .
- (3) A morphism $f : (X, \sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ is of finite σ -type if Y is a finite union of open affine subsets $V_i = \text{Spec}^\sigma(R_i)$ such that for each i , $f^{-1}(V_i)$ is of finite σ -type over (R_i, σ) .

Remark 2.13. The proof of 2.6(7) in fact shows that for any difference ring (A_1, Σ) such that $(A, \sigma) \hookrightarrow (A_1, \sigma) \hookrightarrow (\bar{A}, \sigma)$, we obtain an isomorphism of difference schemes $\text{Spec}^\Sigma(A_1) \rightarrow \text{Spec}^\Sigma(A)$. This observation will prove invaluable for proving certain finiteness properties later on.

For a point x on a difference scheme (X, σ) , we denote by $\mathcal{O}_x$ the local (difference) ring at x , and by $\mathbf{k}(x)$ the residue (difference) field at x .

Definition 2.14. Let $(K, \sigma) \subseteq (L, \sigma)$ be an extension of difference fields.

- (1) An element $\alpha \in L$ is σ -algebraic over K if the set $\{\alpha, \sigma(\alpha), \sigma^2(\alpha), \dots\}$ is algebraically dependent over K .
- (2) The σ -algebraic closure over K defines a *pregeometry* on L and the dimension with respect to this pregeometry is called the σ -transcendence degree. Alternatively, $\sigma\text{-tr.deg}(L/K)$ is the supremum of numbers n such that the difference polynomial ring $K\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ in n variables embeds in L .
- (3) L is σ -separable over K if L is linearly disjoint from K^{inv} over K , where the *inversive closure* (K^{inv}, σ) , is the unique (up to K -isomorphism) difference field extension of (K, σ) where σ is an automorphism of K^{inv} and

$$K^{\text{inv}} = \bigcup_m K^{\sigma^{-m}}.$$

- (4) Suppose L is σ -algebraic of finite σ -type over K , σ -generated by a finite set A . Let $A_k := \bigcup_{i \leq k} \sigma^i(A)$ and let $d_k := [K(A_k) : K(A_{k-1})]$. It is shown in [3] that for every k , $d_k \geq d_{k+1}$ and we may define the *limit degree* as

$$\text{dl}((L, \sigma)/(K, \sigma)) := \min_k d_k.$$

This definition is independent of the choice of the generators. When L/K is σ -algebraic but not necessarily finitely σ -generated, one defines $\text{dl}(L/K)$ as the maximum of $\text{dl}(L'/K)$ where L' runs over the extensions of finite σ -type contained in L .

Before introducing the various dimension/degree invariants of difference schemes, it is useful to define an auxiliary structure where some of those invariant will take values.

The ring $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}[\mathbb{L}]$ admits a natural lexicographic polynomial ordering $\leq$, and an equivalence relation $\approx$, where $u \approx v$ if $u, v \in \mathbb{N}[\mathbb{L}]$ have the same degree in $\mathbb{L}$ and their leading coefficients are equal. We will consider the *rig* (ring without negatives) $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}[\mathbb{L}]/\approx$.

Definition 2.15. Let (k, σ) be a difference field, (K, σ) a difference field extension and let (R, σ) be a (k, σ) -algebra.

- (1) Let the σ -degree of X be

$$\mathbf{d}(K/k) = \text{dl}(K/k) \mathbb{L}^{\text{tr.deg}(K/k)}$$

in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}[\mathbb{L}]/\approx$.

- (2) Let the *effective σ -degree* of X be $\mathbf{d}_{\text{eff}}(K/k) = \mathbf{d}(K^{\text{inv}}/k^{\text{inv}})$.

- (3) Let

$$\mathbf{d}(R/k) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R) \\ \sigma(\mathfrak{p}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}}} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{k}(\mathfrak{p})/k),$$

and analogously for $\mathbf{d}_{\text{eff}}(R/k)$.

- (4) The *limit degree* $\text{dl}(R/k)$ and *total dimension* $\text{dimtot}(R/k)$ are defined through

$$\text{dl}(R/k) \mathbb{L}^{\text{dimtot}(R/k)} \approx \mathbf{d}(R/k),$$

and analogously for the *effective total dimension*.

Definition 2.16. Let (k, σ) be a difference field, and let $(X, \sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ of (k, σ) -difference schemes.

- (1) The σ -dimension of X is $\sigma\text{-dim}(X) = \sup_{x \in X} \sigma\text{-tr.deg}(\mathbf{k}(x)/k)$.

- (2) The *relative σ -dimension*

$$\sigma\text{-dim}(\varphi) = \sup_{y \in Y} \sigma\text{-dim}(X_y),$$

where $X_y = X \times_Y \text{Spec}^\sigma(\mathbf{k}(y))$ is the fibre over y .

- (3) Let the *σ -degree* of X be

$$\mathbf{d}(X) = \sum_{x \in X} \mathbf{d}(\mathcal{O}_x/k),$$

and analogously for $\mathbf{d}_{\text{eff}}(X)$.

- (4) The *limit degree* $\text{dl}(X)$ and *total dimension* $\text{dimtot}(X)$ are defined through

$$\text{dl}(X) \mathbb{L}^{\text{dimtot}(X)} \approx \mathbf{d}(X),$$

and analogously for the *effective total dimension*.

- (5) The *relative σ -degree*

$$\mathbf{d}(\varphi) = \sup_{y \in Y} \mathbf{d}(X_y),$$

and analogously for $\mathbf{d}_{\text{eff}}(\varphi)$. From these we derive the notions of *relative limit degree* and *relative total dimension*.

Remark 2.17. (1) Clearly (cf. [6], [7]), $\sigma\text{-dim}(X) = 0$ if and only if $\text{dimtot}(X)$ and $\text{dimtoteff}(X)$ are finite, and analogously for the relative dimensions. In this case, if in addition φ is of finite σ -type, $\mathbf{d}(\varphi) \in \mathbb{N}[\mathbb{L}]$, i.e., the limit degree is finite.

- (2) When $X = \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$, $\text{dimtot}(X) = \text{dimtot}(R)$, so the above definition is consistent. Indeed, as remarked in [7], the inequality

$$\text{dimtot}(R) \geq \sup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)} \text{dimtot}(R_{\mathfrak{p}})$$

is obvious. In the other direction, let $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$ such that $\sigma(\mathfrak{p}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. Then $\mathfrak{p}$ induces a σ -ideal in $\text{Spec}(R_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}})$, where $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} = \cup_{m>0} \sigma^{-m}(\mathfrak{p})$ is the perfect closure of $\mathfrak{p}$, and the opposite inequality follows.

- (3) When (L, σ) is a σ -separable σ -algebraic extension of (K, σ) , L^{inv} is an algebraic extension of LK^{inv} and

$$\text{tr.deg}(L^{\text{inv}}/K^{\text{inv}}) = \text{tr.deg}(LK^{\text{inv}}/K^{\text{inv}}) = \text{tr.deg}(L/K).$$

Thus, when $\varphi : X \rightarrow Y$ is σ -separable in the sense that for every $x \in X$, the extension $\mathbf{k}(x)/\mathbf{k}(\varphi(x))$ is σ -separable, we get that

$$\mathbf{d}(\varphi) \approx \mathbf{d}_{\text{eff}}(\varphi).$$

- (4) Thanks to the corresponding property of the limit degree and the additivity of total dimension, the σ -degree is multiplicative in towers.
- (5) Let $X = \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$. By the Ritt ascending chain condition for perfect ideals in R ([3]), X is a Noetherian topological space and therefore we get a decomposition of X into irreducible components,

$$X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n,$$

where $X_i = \text{Spec}^\sigma(R/\mathfrak{p}_i)$ for some $\mathfrak{p}_i \in \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$. Equivalently, the zero ideal in R can be represented as

$$0 = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_n.$$

Since X is of transformal dimension 0 (equivalently, of finite total dimension), for $i \neq j$, $\dim_{\text{tot}}(X_i \cap X_j) < \dim_{\text{tot}}(X)$ and the results of [7] entail

$$\mathbf{d}(X) \approx \sum_i \mathbf{d}(X_i) \approx \sum_i \text{dl}(\text{Fract}(R/\mathfrak{p}_i)/k) \mathbb{L}^{\text{tr.deg}(\text{Fract}(R/\mathfrak{p}_i)/k)}.$$

An analogous statement holds for $\mathbf{d}_{\text{eff}}$.

Proposition 2.18 ([7] 3.10.2). *Let (R, σ) be a well-mixed difference algebra of finite σ -type over a difference field k and suppose I is a perfect non-zero ideal. Then $\dim_{\text{tot}}(R/I) < \dim_{\text{tot}}(R)$.*

3. LOCAL VS. GLOBAL PROPERTIES

For the proofs of the following statements up to 3.10, we refer the reader to [10].

Definition 3.1. Let (M, σ) be an (A, σ) -module and let (N, σ) be a submodule.

- (1) We say that (M, σ) is *well-mixed* if $am = 0$ implies $\sigma(a)m = 0$ for all $a \in A$, $m \in M$.
- (2) We say that (N, σ) is a *well-mixed submodule* of (M, σ) if the module M/N is well-mixed.

Clearly (M, σ) is well-mixed if and only if the annihilator $\text{Ann}(m)$ of any $m \in M$ is a well-mixed σ -ideal in (A, σ) . Indeed, if $ab \in \text{Ann}(m)$, then $a(bm) = 0$ so $\sigma(a)(bm) = (\sigma(a)b)m = 0$ so $\sigma(a)b \in \text{Ann}(m)$.

Moreover, since the intersection of well-mixed submodules is well-mixed and M is trivially a well-mixed submodule of itself, for every submodule (N, σ) of (M, σ) there exists a smallest well-mixed submodule $[N]_w$ containing N . Thus $[0]_w$ is the smallest well-mixed submodule of (M, σ) associated with the largest well-mixed quotient M_w of M .

Proposition 3.2. *Let (M, σ) be a well-mixed (A, σ) -module. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) $M = 0$;
- (2) $M_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$ for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$.
- (3) $M_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$ for every $\mathfrak{p}$ maximal in $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$.

Corollary 3.3. *Let (M, σ) be an (A, σ) -module. If $(M_{\mathfrak{p}})_w = 0$ for every $\mathfrak{p}$ maximal in $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$, then $M_w = 0$.*

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\phi : (M, \sigma) \rightarrow (N, \sigma)$ be an (A, σ) -module homomorphism and assume that (M, σ) is well-mixed. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) ϕ is injective;
- (2) $\phi_{\mathfrak{p}} : M_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow N_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is injective for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$.
- (3) $\phi_{\mathfrak{p}} : M_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow N_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is injective for every $\mathfrak{p}$ maximal in $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\phi : (M, \sigma) \rightarrow (N, \sigma)$ be an (A, σ) -module homomorphism. If $\phi_{\mathfrak{p}} : M_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow N_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is almost surjective for every $\mathfrak{p}$ maximal in $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$, then ϕ is almost surjective, $[\text{im}(\phi)]_w = N$ (equivalently, $\text{coker}(\phi)_w = 0$).*

Proof. Let $N' = \text{coker}(\phi)$. Then $M \rightarrow N \rightarrow N' \rightarrow 0$ is exact, and by localisation $M_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow N_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow N'_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow 0$ is exact for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$. By assumption, $(N'_{\mathfrak{p}})_w = 0$ for all $\mathfrak{p}$ maximal in $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$ and 3.3 implies that $N'_w = 0$. $\square$

Proposition 3.6. *Let (M, σ) and (N, σ) be (A, σ) -modules with (N, σ) well-mixed. Then $(M, \sigma) \otimes_{(A, \sigma)} (N, \sigma)$ is well-mixed.*

Proposition 3.7. *Let (M, σ) be a well-mixed (A, σ) -module. The following are equivalent.*

- (1) *M is a flat A -module.*
- (2) *$M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a flat $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$.*
- (3) *$M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a flat $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module for every $\mathfrak{p}$ maximal in $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$.*

Remark 3.8. Let $(A, \sigma) \rightarrow (B, \sigma)$ be a homomorphism of well-mixed difference rings such that B is a flat A -module and denote by $\bar{A}$ and $\bar{B}$ the rings of global sections of $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$ and $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(B)$. We can consider $\bar{B}$ as an A -module via the morphism $A \hookrightarrow \bar{A} \rightarrow \bar{B}$ as in 2.9, and we can conclude that $\bar{B}$ is flat over A .

Proposition 3.9. *Let (A, σ) be a well-mixed domain. If $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is normal for every $\mathfrak{p}$ maximal in $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(A)$, then A is almost normal.*

Proposition 3.10 (Difference Chinese Remainder Theorem). *Let (R, σ) be a difference ring and let $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_n$ be pairwise weakly separated difference ideals, i.e. $\{\mathfrak{p}_i + \mathfrak{p}_j\} = R$ for $i \neq j$. The natural morphism*

$$R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{p}_1 \times \cdots \times R/\mathfrak{p}_n$$

is almost surjective, with kernel $\cap_i \mathfrak{p}_i$.

Proof. From the maximality of the $\mathfrak{p}_i$, no $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is contained in $\mathfrak{p}_j$ for $i \neq j$. Let us consider the above difference ring morphism as a morphism φ of (R, σ) -modules. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a maximal element of $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(R)$. The condition of weak separatedness implies that $\mathfrak{p}$ contains at most one $\mathfrak{p}_i$. If $\mathfrak{p}_i \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, then $(R/\mathfrak{p}_i)_{\mathfrak{p}} \simeq R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_i R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and if $\mathfrak{p}_i \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, $(R/\mathfrak{p}_i)_{\mathfrak{p}} \simeq 0$. Thus, localising φ at $\mathfrak{p}$ containing some $\mathfrak{p}_i$ yields the natural morphism $\varphi_{\mathfrak{p}} : R_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_i R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, which is surjective. Localising at a maximal element $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^{\sigma}(R)$ not containing any of the $\mathfrak{p}_i$ yields $\varphi_{\mathfrak{p}} : R_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow 0$, which is again surjective. Therefore, $\varphi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is surjective for every maximal $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^{\sigma}(R)$ and we deduce by 3.5 that φ is almost surjective. $\square$

Corollary 3.11. *Let (R, σ) be a well-mixed difference ring and suppose that $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(R)$ is finite and consists only of maximal elements $\{\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_n\}$, say. Then the natural morphism*

$$R \mapsto R_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \times \cdots \times R_{\mathfrak{p}_n},$$

mapping $r \mapsto (r/1, \dots, r/1)$, is injective and almost surjective.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{q}_i = \ker(R \rightarrow R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}) = \{x : \text{there exists an } r \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}_i, rx = 0\}$, so that $R/\mathfrak{q}_i \hookrightarrow R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$. Since $\text{Spec}^{\sigma} R_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = \{0, \mathfrak{p}_i R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}\}$, $\mathfrak{p}_i R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ consists of σ -nilpotent elements, so $\mathfrak{p}_i/\mathfrak{q}_i$ consists only of σ -nilpotent elements and we conclude that $\{\mathfrak{q}_i\} = \mathfrak{p}_i$ and by maximality, $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is the only element of $\text{Spec}^{\sigma}(R)$ that contains $\mathfrak{q}_i$. Thus no $\mathfrak{p}_i$ contains both $\mathfrak{q}_i$ and $\mathfrak{q}_j$ for $i \neq j$ so $\{\mathfrak{q}_i + \mathfrak{q}_j\} = R$ for $i \neq j$, i.e. the $\mathfrak{q}_i$ are pairwise weakly separated.

We claim that $\cap_i \mathfrak{q}_i = 0$. To this end, pick an $x \in \cap_i \mathfrak{q}_i$. By the definition of $\mathfrak{q}_i$, this means that for every i there is an $r_i \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}_i$ such that $r_i x = 0$. Since R is well-mixed, we get that $\sigma^l(r_i)x = 0$ for all l . Thus, letting $I = \langle r_1, \dots, r_n \rangle_{\sigma}$, we have that $Ix = 0$. But $I \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}_i$ for any i , so $I = R$ and $1 \cdot x = 0$ so $x = 0$.

By the Difference Chinese Remainder Theorem 3.10, we get that $R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{q}_1 \times \cdots \times R/\mathfrak{q}_n$ is injective and almost surjective, and it remains to show that $R/\mathfrak{q}_i \hookrightarrow$

$R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is bijective. However, by the above discussion, $R/\mathfrak{q}_i$ is a local ring with maximal ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i = \mathfrak{p}_i/\mathfrak{q}_i$ so $R/\mathfrak{q}_i \simeq (R/\mathfrak{q}_i)_{\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i} \simeq R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}/\mathfrak{q}_i R_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \simeq R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$. $\square$

4. DIFFERENCE CURVES

Definition 4.1. An *affine difference curve* is a difference scheme of the form $(X, \Sigma) = \text{Spec}^\Sigma(R)$ where (R, Σ) is an algebra of finite σ -type over a difference field (k, σ) which is integral and of total dimension 1.

Remark 4.2. It is immediate from 2.18 that the set of closed points of (X, σ) corresponds to the set of σ -height one ideals in $\text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$.

5. NAKAYAMA WITH A DIFFERENCE

Lemma 5.1. *Let (k, σ) be a difference field. The Jacobson ideal of the skew polynomial ring $k[x; \sigma]$ is zero.*

Proof. By [1],

$$J(k[x; \sigma]) = \left\{ \sum_i \alpha_i x^i : \alpha_0 \in I \cap J(k), \alpha_i \in I, i \geq 1 \right\} = \left\{ \sum_{i \geq 1} \alpha_i x^i : \alpha_i \in I \right\},$$

where $I = \{\alpha \in k : \alpha x \in J(k[x; \sigma])\}$. Thus, $\alpha \in I$ implies that αx belongs to every maximal ideal. In particular, the ideal $\langle x - 1 \rangle$ being maximal by [2], Exercise 3.2.1, we get that $\alpha x \in \langle x - 1 \rangle$, which implies $\alpha = 0$. $\square$

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \sigma)$ be a local difference ring. The Jacobson radical of the skew polynomial ring $R[x; \sigma]$ consists of the twisted polynomials with coefficients in $\mathfrak{m}$, i.e.,*

$$J(R[x; \sigma]) = \mathfrak{m}[x; \sigma].$$

Proof. Let us denote by $\pi_0 : R \rightarrow k = R/\mathfrak{m}$ the residue map, and consider the morphism $\pi : R[x; \sigma] \rightarrow k[x; \sigma]$ defined by $\pi(\sum_i a_i x^i) = \sum_i \pi_0(a_i) x^i$.

Since π is surjective, $\pi(J(R[x; \sigma])) \subseteq J(k[x; \sigma])$. By 5.1, $J(k[x; \sigma]) = 0$ and therefore $J(R[x; \sigma]) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(0) = \mathfrak{m}[x; \sigma]$.

On the other hand, let I be a maximal ideal in $R[x; \sigma]$. Then $I \subseteq \pi^{-1}(\pi(I))$ so by the maximality of I , either $I = \pi^{-1}(\pi(I))$ or $\pi^{-1}(\pi(I)) = R$, but the latter is impossible since π is onto.

Thus, for every maximal I , $\mathfrak{m}[x; \sigma] = \pi^{-1}(0) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(\pi(I)) = I$ so $J(R[x; \sigma]) \supseteq \mathfrak{m}[x; \sigma]$ as well. $\square$

Proposition 5.3 (Nakayama's Lemma/Jacobson-Azumaya's Theorem—classical version). *Let R be a unitary ring and let M be a finitely generated left R -module, and let I be an ideal contained in the Jacobson radical of R , $I \subseteq J(R)$. Then $IM = M$ implies that $M = 0$.*

Proposition 5.4 (Nakayama's Lemma—skew version). *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \sigma)$ be a local difference ring, and let M be a finitely generated $R[x; \sigma]$ -module. Then $\mathfrak{m}[x; \sigma]M = M$ implies $M = 0$.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of the classical version, using the fact that $J(R[x; \sigma]) = \mathfrak{m}[x; \sigma]$ established in 5.2. $\square$

Proposition 5.5 (Nakayama's Lemma—difference version). *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \sigma)$ be a local difference ring and let (M, σ) be a finitely σ -generated (R, σ) -module. If $\mathfrak{m}M = M$, then $M = 0$.*

Proof. We can consider M as a natural left $R[x; \sigma]$ -module and the condition that (M, σ) is finitely σ -generated as an (R, σ) -module implies that M is a finitely generated $R[s; \sigma]$ -module. Given that $\mathfrak{m}M = \mathfrak{m}[x; \sigma]M$, it suffices to apply the skew version. $\square$

Corollary 5.6. *Let (M, σ) be a finitely σ -generated $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \sigma)$ -module, and let (N, σ) be a (R, σ) -submodule. If $M = \mathfrak{m}M + N$, then $M = N$.*

Proof. Apply the difference version of Nakayama to M/N , observing that $\mathfrak{m}(M/N) = (\mathfrak{m}M + N)/N$. $\square$

Proposition 5.7. *Let (M, σ) be finitely σ -generated $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \sigma)$ -module and assume $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M$ are such that their images in $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ σ -span this $(k, \sigma) = (R/\mathfrak{m}, \sigma)$ -vector space. Then the x_i σ -generate M .*

Proof. Let N be the submodule of M σ -generated by the x_i . Then $N \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/\mathfrak{m}M$ maps N onto $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ and $N + \mathfrak{m}M = M$ so $N = M$ by the Corollary. $\square$

Remark 5.8. It may not be possible to choose $x_1, \dots, x_n$ such that they σ -freely span $M/\mathfrak{m}M$.

6. NON-SINGULARITY

Proposition 6.1. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \sigma)$ be a local difference ring of total dimension 1 with residue field k . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathfrak{m}$ is σ -principal, i.e., it is σ -generated by a single element;
- (2) the (k, σ) -vector space $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ is σ -generated by a single element.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}, \sigma)$ be a local difference ring of total dimension 1 with residue field k . If the (ordinary) vector space dimension of the k -vector space $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ is 1, then the completion $\hat{R} = \varprojlim_i R/\mathfrak{m}^i$ of R is a discrete valuation ring and $\hat{\mathfrak{m}}$ is principal.*

However, in the above proposition, it does not follow that R itself is a discrete valuation ring. For our purposes, the notions of non-singularity that might be extrapolated from the above propositions are not sufficiently well-behaved, so we choose to work with the following stronger notion.

Definition 6.3. Let X be a difference curve and let $x \in X$ be a closed point. We say that x is *non-singular* or *regular* if the difference local ring $(\mathcal{O}_x, \mathfrak{m}_x, \sigma)$ is a regular local domain of dimension one in the usual sense, i.e., a discrete valuation ring. We say that X is *non-singular* or *regular* if it is so at every point $x \in X$.

Given the similarity of this definition with the definition of non-singularity in classical algebraic geometry, one might ask whether it is reasonable to expect to have any non-singular points whatsoever, especially in view of the fact that the underlying ring R of X is typically not Noetherian. The following result (which is a special case of more general consideration from [10]) puts one's mind at rest.

Proposition 6.4 (Generic non-singularity). *Let X be a difference curve over a difference field of characteristic 0. There is a nonempty open subset U of X such that every point of U is non-singular.*

Proof. Suppose $X = \operatorname{Spec}^\sigma(R)$ with R finitely σ -generated domain over a difference field k , i.e. there exists a finite tuple $\bar{a} = a_1, \dots, a_n$ such that $R = k[\bar{a}]_\sigma = k[\bar{a}, \sigma\bar{a}, \dots]$. Let K be the fraction field of R , and consider $R_i = k[\bar{a}, \sigma\bar{a}, \dots, \sigma^i\bar{a}]$ and the corresponding field of fractions K_i . From the theory of limit degree, we know that there exist N and d such that for $i \geq N$, $[K_{i+1} : K_i] = d$. By taking a larger set of generators, we may assume that $N = 0$, i.e., for all $i \geq 0$, $[K_{i+1} : K_i] = d$. Since K_1 is separable over K_0 , there exists an $\alpha \in K_1$ such that $K_0(\sigma\bar{a}) = K_1 = K_0(\alpha)$. There is no harm in assuming that α is integral over R_0 with minimal polynomial f over R_0 . Since α generates K_1 , we have

$$\sigma a_i = \sum_j \gamma_{ij} \alpha^j,$$

for some $\gamma_{ij} \in K_0$. By σ -localising with denominators of γ_{ij} , we may assume that $R_1 \subseteq R_0[\alpha]$. By σ -localising further, we may assume that all σa_i are integral over R_0 . Using $K_1 = K_0(\alpha)$, it follows that α is a K_0 -linear combination of (bounded) powers of σa_i and we need another σ -localisation to finally conclude that $R_1 = R_0[\alpha]$, thus making R_1 into a finite free R_0 -module. This in turn implies that $R_{i+1} = R_i[\sigma^i\alpha]$ for all i , and the minimal polynomial of $\sigma^i\alpha$ over K_i is f^{σ^i} .

By generic non-singularity, we can localise to make R_0 a regular ring, and by generic étaleness (or by just σ -localising by f') we can assume that R_1 is étale over R_0 , i.e., that the formal derivative f' is invertible in R_1 . This entails that each $(f^{\sigma^i})' = (f')^{\sigma^i}$ is invertible in R_{i+1} , which means that each R_{i+1} is étale over R_i . We are now in a situation where, given an $x \in \operatorname{Spec}^\sigma(R)$, and writing x_i for the corresponding projection in $\operatorname{Spec}(R_i)$, the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is a discrete valued ring, being the direct limit of the unramified system of discrete valuation rings $\mathcal{O}_{\operatorname{Spec}(R_i), x_i}$. $\square$

Remark 6.5. The same result holds in positive characteristic if X has enough separability built in, for example if the reduced limit degree of X equals its limit degree.

Lemma 6.6. *Let X be a non-singular difference curve and let $x \in X$ be a non-singular point.*

- (1) *For any $f \in \mathcal{O}_x$, $\sigma(f)/f \in \mathcal{O}_x$.*
- (2) *For any $f \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$, $\sigma(f)/f \in \mathcal{O}_X(X)$.*

Proof. Statement (2) is immediate from (1). To see (1), if t is the uniformiser at x (i.e. the generator of $\mathfrak{m}_x$), it suffices to check that $\sigma(t)/t \in \mathcal{O}_x$. However, since $\sigma(\mathfrak{m}_x) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_x$, $\sigma(t)$ must be divisible by t . $\square$

Definition 6.7. Let (R, σ) be a difference domain, let $X = \operatorname{Spec}^\sigma(R)$, and denote by $X^{(1)} = \operatorname{Spec}^{\sigma, (1)}(R) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}^\sigma(R) : \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = 1\}$ the set of height one σ -prime ideals. We say that (R, σ) is a σ -Krull domain if

- (DVR) for each $\mathfrak{p} \in X^{(1)}$, the localisation $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a discrete valuation ring;
- (INT) considering $\tilde{R} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in X^{(1)}} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ as an (R, σ) -module, $[R]_w = \tilde{R}$;
- (FC) each $f \in R \setminus \{0\}$ is contained in only finitely many $\mathfrak{p}$ from $X^{(1)}$.

Remark 6.8. Let $X = \operatorname{Spec}^\sigma(R)$ be a non-singular difference curve. Given that for each $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}^\sigma(R)$, $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a discrete valuation ring, we have that each non-zero $\mathfrak{p}$ must be of (ordinary) height 1. In view of 4.2, we conclude that the set

of closed points of X corresponds to the set of height one elements of $\text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$, which equals the set of σ -height one elements of $\text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$. Thus, in the case of non-singular curves, we can use the notation $\text{Spec}^{\sigma,(1)}(R)$ for the latter two sets without confusion.

Proposition 6.9. *Let $X = \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$ be a non-singular difference curve. We have the following.*

- (1) (R, σ) is a σ -Krull domain and $\tilde{R} = \bar{R} \cap K$.
- (2) $\tilde{R}$ is a Krull domain (in the usual sense) and $\text{Spec}^{(1)}(\tilde{R}) = X^0$.

Proof. (1) Firstly we note that by 6.8, $X^{(1)}$ is the set of all closed points, so the property (DVR) follows from the definition of non-singularity. For (FC), let us take some nonzero $f \in R$. By the Ritt property ([7] 3.3.2), we have a unique irredundant decomposition $V^\sigma(f) = V^\sigma(\mathfrak{p}_1) \cup \dots \cup V^\sigma(\mathfrak{p}_n)$ with $\mathfrak{p}_i \in \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$. Equivalently, $\{f\}_\sigma = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_n$, so $\mathfrak{p}_i$ are clearly the only ideals of σ -height 1 containing f . By 6.8, $\tilde{R} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)} R_\mathfrak{p}$, and consider the inclusion $R \rightarrow \tilde{R}$ as a morphism of (R, σ) -modules. Then, for each $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$, its localisation $R_\mathfrak{p} \rightarrow \tilde{R}_\mathfrak{p} = R_\mathfrak{p}$ is onto, so we conclude that $[R]_w = \tilde{R}$, thus establishing the property (INT). Let us write $\bar{R}$ for the global sections ring $\mathcal{O}_X(X)$. By 6.6, for every $f \in R$, $\sigma(f)/f \in \bar{R}$, so $\tilde{R} = [R]_w \subseteq \bar{R}$. Conversely, if $a/b \in \bar{R}$, by the definition of global sections, for each $\mathfrak{p}$ we have that $a/b \in R_\mathfrak{p}$, so $a/b \in \tilde{R}$.

(2) Since $\tilde{R}$ is an intersection of discrete valuation rings, in order to show that it is Krull, it suffices to show that it has the finite character property, i.e., that every $\bar{s} \in \tilde{R}$ is not a unit in only finitely many of those.

But we have even more, i.e., every $\bar{s} \in \bar{R}$ is only contained in finitely many elements of $\text{Spec}^\sigma(\bar{R}) \simeq \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$. Indeed, by 2.6, for every $\mathfrak{p}_0 \in \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$ there exist $g, a \in R$ with $g \notin \mathfrak{p}$ such that $g\bar{s} = a$ on $\text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$. Thus, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in D^\sigma(g)$, $\bar{s} \in \bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ if and only if $a \in \mathfrak{p}$. Thus, every $\mathfrak{p}_0 \in \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$ has a neighbourhood in which $\bar{s}$ has only finitely many ‘zeroes’. By quasi-compactness of $\text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$, it follows that $\bar{s}$ has only finitely many ‘zeroes’ altogether.

Denote $Y = \text{Spec}^\sigma(\tilde{R})^0 = \text{Spec}^{\sigma,(1)}(\tilde{R}) \subseteq \text{Spec}^{(1)}(\tilde{R})$. By 2.13, $Y \simeq X^0 = X^{(1)}$, so $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in Y} \tilde{R}_\mathfrak{p} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in X^0} R_\mathfrak{p} = \tilde{R}$ again, we see that $\tilde{R}$ is a subintersection and [5], Proposition 3.15, implies that $\text{Spec}^{(1)}(\tilde{R}) = Y \simeq X^0$. $\square$

Lemma 6.10 ([8], Exercise 1.6). *Let A be a ring, $I, P_1, \dots, P_r$ ideals of A and suppose $P_3, \dots, P_r$ prime and I is not contained in any of the P_i . Then there exists an $x \in I$ not contained in any P_i .*

Proposition 6.11 (Approximation theorem). *Let (R, σ) be a σ -Krull domain with fraction field K . Let $X = \text{Spec}^\sigma(R)$ and let $X^{(1)} = \text{Spec}^{\sigma,(1)}(R)$ be the set of elements of X of height 1. Suppose we are given $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r \in X^{(1)}$ and $e_1, \dots, e_r \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists an $f \in K$ such that $v_{\mathfrak{p}_i}(f) = e_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f) \geq 0$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in X^{(1)} \setminus \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r\}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{p}_i$ are of height 1, there are no inclusions between them. Since each $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is a discrete valuation ring, $\mathfrak{p}_i \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}_i^{(2)} = \mathfrak{p}_i^2 R_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \cap A$. By 6.10, there exist $g_i \in \mathfrak{p}_i \setminus (\mathfrak{p}_i^{(2)} \cup \bigcup_{j \neq i} \mathfrak{p}_j)$. Then $v_{\mathfrak{p}_j}(g_i) = \delta_{ij}$ and we set $g = \prod_{i=1}^r g_i^{e_i}$. Let $\mathfrak{p}'_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}'_s$ be all the elements $\mathfrak{p}$ of $X^{(1)} \setminus \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r\}$ such that $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(g) < 0$. Then choosing for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ an element $t_j \in \mathfrak{p}'_j \setminus \bigcup_i \mathfrak{p}_i$, we see that $f = g(t_1, \dots, t_s)^l$ satisfies the requirements of the theorem for sufficiently large l . $\square$

7. MULTIPLICITIES, DIVISORS

Definition 7.1. Let $X = \operatorname{Spec}^\sigma(R)$ be a non-singular difference curve over a difference field k and let $X^0 = X^{(1)}$ be the set of closed (height one) points. A *prime divisor* on X is just an element of X^0 . A *Weil divisor* is an element of the free abelian group $\operatorname{Div} X$ generated by $X^{(1)}$. A divisor $D = \sum_i n_i x_i$ is *effective* if all $n_i \geq 0$.

Definition 7.2. Let X be as above and let K be its function field (the fraction field of R). For $f \in K^\times$, we let the *divisor* (f) of f on X be

$$(f) = \sum_{x \in X^{(1)}} v_x(f) \cdot x.$$

By 6.9, this is a divisor. Any divisor which is equal to the divisor of a function is called a *principal* divisor.

Note that $(f/g) = (f) - (g)$ so $f \mapsto (f)$ is a homomorphism $K^\times \rightarrow \operatorname{Div} X$ whose image is the subgroup of principal divisors.

Definition 7.3. Let X be a non-singular difference curve over k . Two divisors $D, D' \in \operatorname{Div} X$ are *linearly equivalent*, written $D \sim D'$, if $D - D'$ is a principal divisor. The *divisor class group* $\operatorname{Cl} X$ is the quotient of $\operatorname{Div} X$ by the subgroup of principal divisors.

Remark 7.4. There exists a well-developed theory of divisors on Krull domains, cf. [5]. In view of 6.9, comparing the definitions, we see that the group of divisors (resp. the divisor class group) of a non-singular difference curve $X = \operatorname{Spec}^\sigma(R)$ is nothing other than the group of divisors (resp. the divisor class group) of the Krull domain $\tilde{R}$ associated with it. The general theory shows that, in this non-singular case, the theory of Weil divisors coincides with the theory of *Cartier divisors* and *invertible sheaves*, but we shall not need these in the present paper.

Definition 7.5. For a divisor $D = \sum_i n_i x_i$, we define the *degree* of D as $\deg(D) = \sum_i n_i \cdot \operatorname{dl}(\mathbf{k}(x_i)/k)$, making $\deg$ into a homomorphism $\operatorname{Div} X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.

8. RAMIFICATION AND PRESERVATION OF MULTIPLICITY

Definition 8.1. Let $(B, \sigma) \rightarrow (A, \sigma)$ be an extension of difference rings. We say that (A, σ) is *σ -finite* over (B, σ) if B is integral of finite σ -type over A . It is equivalent to say that there exists a finite tuple $a = a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$, such that, writing $A_i = B[a, \sigma a, \dots, \sigma^{i-1} a]$, A_{i+1} is a finite A_i module for every $i \geq 0$ and $A = \cup_i A_i$.

Definition 8.2. Suppose we have a morphism $\pi : (X, \Sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$, and we pick a point $y \in Y$ and $x \in X$ with $\pi(x) = y$. The *ramification index* of π at x is defined as

$$e_x(\pi) = v_x(\pi^\# t_y),$$

where $\pi^\#$ is the local morphism $\mathcal{O}_y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_x$ induced by π and t_y is a uniformiser at y , i.e., a generator of the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_y$.

When π is σ -finite, we can define a morphism $\pi^* : \operatorname{Div} Y \rightarrow \operatorname{Div} X$ by extending the rule

$$\pi^*(y) = \sum_{\pi(x)=y} e_x(\pi) \cdot x$$

for prime divisors $y \in Y$ by linearity to $\text{Div} Y$.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $\varphi : (X, \sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be a σ -finite morphism of non-singular difference curves. For $y \in Y$, assume $\varphi^{-1}(y) = \{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \neq \emptyset$ and let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \cap_i \mathcal{O}_{x_i}$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is almost σ -finite over $\mathcal{O}_y$.*

Proof. We may assume that X and Y are affine, $X = \text{Spec}^\sigma(A)$ and $Y = \text{Spec}^\sigma(B)$. Then we have $(\mathbf{k}(Y), \sigma) \hookrightarrow (\mathbf{k}(X), \sigma)$, which allows us to consider $\mathbf{k}(Y)$ as a subfield of $\mathbf{k}(X)$. Moreover, A is σ -finite over B . Let us prove that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \tilde{A}\mathcal{O}_y$. If $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ and z_i are the poles of f on X , then $y_i = \varphi(z_i) \neq y$. By the Approximation Theorem 6.11, there exists a function h such that $h(y) \neq 0$, $h(y_i) = 0$ and $fh \in \mathcal{O}_{z_i}$. Thus, $fh \in \tilde{A}$, and since $h^{-1} \in \mathcal{O}_y$, we get that $f \in \tilde{A}\mathcal{O}_y$. This establishes that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \subseteq \tilde{A}\mathcal{O}_y$, and the converse inclusion is obvious.

Now, since A is σ -finite over B , we get that $A\mathcal{O}_y$ is σ -finite over $\mathcal{O}_y$, so $\tilde{A}\mathcal{O}_y$ is almost σ -finite over $\mathcal{O}_y$. $\square$

Proposition 8.4. *Let $\varphi : (X, \sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be a strongly σ -finite morphism of non-singular difference curves. For $y \in Y$, assume $\varphi^{-1}(y) = \{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \neq \emptyset$ and let $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \cap_i \mathcal{O}_{x_i}$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is σ -free over $\mathcal{O}_y$ of limit rank $\text{dl}(X/Y)$.*

Proof. Since the statement is local, we can reduce to the case where φ is Spec^σ of some morphism $(B, \sigma) \rightarrow (A, \sigma)$ so that $\tilde{A}$ is σ -finite over $\tilde{B}$. Thus $\tilde{A}$ is a direct limit of some $\tilde{A}_i$ such that $\tilde{A}_{i+1}$ is finite over $\tilde{A}_i$ for $i \geq 0$ and $A_0 = \tilde{B}$. By 8.3, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \tilde{A}\mathcal{O}_y$, which is then σ -finite over $\mathcal{O}_y$. In other words, we can write $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ as the direct limit of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$ such that each $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i+1}$ is finite over $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$ for $i \geq 0$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_0 = \mathcal{O}_y$. At the same time, we can arrange that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i = \cap_j \mathcal{O}_{\pi_i(x_j)}$ where $\pi_i(x_j)$ is the projection of x_j to the i -th component X_i of the system of prolongations corresponding to the $\tilde{A}_i$ above. By non-singularity, each $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_i(x_j)}$ is a discrete valuation ring and thus each $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$ is in particular a Prüfer domain, being a finite intersection of discrete valuation rings. Using the main structure theorem for modules over Prüfer domains, since each $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i+1}$ is a finite module over $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$, it decomposes into a free part and a torsion part. Since both $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i+1}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$ are contained in the field $\mathbf{k}(X)$, the torsion part is trivial and we conclude that each $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i+1}$ is a free $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$ -module, of rank r_i , say. It remains to show that $r_i = d_i$ where $d_i = [\mathbf{k}(X_{i+1}) : \mathbf{k}(X_i)]$. The rank r_i is the maximal size of a subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i+1}$ which is linearly independent over $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$, or, equivalently, over $\mathbf{k}(X_i)$. Clearly, $r_i \leq d_i$, so we need to find d_i elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i+1}$ constituting a set which is linearly independent over $\mathbf{k}(X_i)$. Starting with a basis $g_1, \dots, g_{d_i}$ of $\mathbf{k}(X_{i+1})$ over $\mathbf{k}(X_i)$, let e be greater than the order of poles of any g_j at $\pi_{i+1}(x_l)$. Let t_y be the uniformiser at y and let f denote the image of t_y^e in $K(X_0) \subseteq K(X_i)$. We have that $f g_j$ is regular at every $\pi_{i+1}(x_l)$. Thus $\{f g_1, \dots, f g_{d_i}\}$ is contained in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i+1}$ and yet it is still linearly independent over $\mathbf{k}(X_i)$. $\square$

Theorem 8.5. *Let $\varphi : (X, \sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be as in 8.4. Then, for every $y \in Y$, if $\varphi^{-1}(y) = \{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \neq \emptyset$, then*

$$\deg(\varphi^*(y)) = \text{dl}(X/Y).$$

Proof. By 8.4, we know that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \cap_i \mathcal{O}_{x_i}$ is σ -free over $\mathcal{O}_y$ of limit rank $\text{dl}(X/Y)$. Let $t = t_y$ be a uniformiser at y , $\mathbf{m}_y = (t_y)$. Then $t\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \cap_i (t\mathcal{O}_{x_i} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{O}})$, so by the Difference Chinese Remainder Theorem 3.10,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}/t\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \approx \tilde{\mathcal{O}}/t\mathcal{O}_{x_1} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \times \dots \times \tilde{\mathcal{O}}/t\mathcal{O}_{x_r} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{x_1}/t\mathcal{O}_{x_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{O}_{x_r}/t\mathcal{O}_{x_r}.$$

Note that by 6.6, the right-hand side is automatically well-mixed as an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ -module so above is in fact an isomorphism, and not only almost-isomorphism. Taking the limit degree of both sides over $k(y)$ gives the equality

$$\mathrm{dl}(X/Y) = e_1 \mathrm{dl}(\mathbf{k}(x_1)/\mathbf{k}(y)) + \cdots + e_r \mathrm{dl}(\mathbf{k}(x_r)/\mathbf{k}(y)),$$

as required. $\square$

The above result is not completely satisfactory as it carries the assumption that $\varphi^{-1}(y) \neq \emptyset$, which typically will not be satisfied quite often, for a dense set of y 's. We need to find a situation in which the morphism φ can be made surjective, and the solution is offered by the framework of *generalised difference schemes*.

Theorem 8.6. *Let $\varphi : (X, \Sigma) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma)$ be a strongly Σ -finite morphism of non-singular curves which is a generic Galois covering. Then, for every $y \in Y$,*

$$\deg(\varphi^*(y)) = |\Sigma| \mathrm{dl}(X/Y).$$

Proof. Using standard reductions as in the previous proofs, we reduce the problem to the following algebraic situation. We have a morphism $(B, \sigma) \rightarrow (A, \Sigma)$ making (A, Σ) Σ -finite over (B, σ) , and their associated difference curves are non-singular, so we may assume that A and B are normal domains with fraction fields L and K . We also know that Σ is a finite set of representatives of isomorphism classes of all lifts of σ from K to L and that L is Galois over K . Using Babbitt's Decomposition for the extension $(K, \sigma) \rightarrow (L, \Sigma)$, we obtain a sequence of difference field extensions

$$(K, \sigma) \rightarrow (L_0, \Sigma) \rightarrow (L_1, \Sigma) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow (L_n, \Sigma) = (L, \Sigma),$$

such that L_0 is finite over K and each L_{i+1} is benign over L_i for $i \geq 0$. Let A_i be the integral closure of B in L_i . By assumptions of σ -finiteness, we know that $A_n = A$. By Theorem 13.14 in [4], A_0 is a B -lattice in L_0 . Thus, if we consider $y \in \mathrm{Spec}^\sigma(B) = Y$, $(B \setminus I_y)^{-1}A_0$ is integral over $\mathcal{O}_y$ and is contained in a finite $\mathcal{O}_y$ -module. By non-singularity, $\mathcal{O}_y$ is noetherian so $(B \setminus I_y)^{-1}A_0$ is a finite $\mathcal{O}_y$ -module and we conclude that $(\varphi^{-1}(y), \Sigma) \rightarrow (y, \sigma)$ is a Galois covering and thus onto. Moreover, from the assumptions, for every $\tilde{\sigma} \in \Sigma$, $(A_n, \tilde{\sigma}) \rightarrow (A_0, \tilde{\sigma})$ is σ -finite and surjective, as a tower of benign extensions. We can finish the proof in two different ways.

The first is to note that the statement is compatible with taking composites so it suffices to check it for the morphism $(A_n, \Sigma) \rightarrow (A_0, \Sigma)$ and for $(A_0, \Sigma) \rightarrow (B, \sigma)$, where the former follows by applying 8.5, and the latter follows along the lines of the usual proof of the corresponding statement for algebraic curves.

The second way is to apply 8.5 to each $(A_n, \tilde{\sigma}) \rightarrow (B, \sigma)$ for $\tilde{\sigma} \in \Sigma$ while making sure to account for the fact that the ramification index at $x \in \mathrm{Spec}^\Sigma(A_0)$ in the morphism associated with $(B, \sigma) \rightarrow (A_0, \Sigma)$ equals the size of $\Sigma_x = \{\tilde{\sigma} \in \Sigma : \tilde{\sigma}(x) = x\}$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Surinder Singh Bedi and Jai Ram. Jacobson radical of skew polynomial rings and skew group rings. *Israel J. Math.*, 35(4):327–338, 1980.
- [2] A. J. Berrick and M. E. Keating. *An introduction to rings and modules with K-theory in view*, volume 65 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

- [3] Richard M. Cohn. *Difference algebra*. Interscience Publishers John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 1965.
- [4] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, volume 150 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. With a view toward algebraic geometry.
- [5] Robert M. Fossum. *The divisor class group of a Krull domain*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 74*.
- [6] Ehud Hrushovski. The elementary theory of the Frobenius automorphism. Preprint, 2004.
- [7] Yves Laszlo. Notes informelles sur la géométrie aux différences. Preprint, 2005.
- [8] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative ring theory*, volume 8 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1989. Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid.
- [9] Mark Ryten and Ivan Tomašić. ACFA and measurability. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 11(3-4):523–537, 2005.
- [10] Ivan Tomašić. Twisted Galois Stratification. <http://www.maths.qmul.ac.uk/~ivan/tgals.pdf>.
- [11] Ivan Tomašić. Fields with measure and automorphism. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 41(3):429–440, 2009.

IVAN TOMAŠIĆ, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, QUEEN MARY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON,
LONDON, E1 4NS, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: `i.tomasic@qmul.ac.uk`